

REMARKS

Examiner Interview:

Attorney for Applicants thanks the Examiner for an interview granted Dec. 17, 2008, at which the Examiner suggested that “comprising” be explained with the components “are within each of the electronic devices, wherein the electronic device is independently operating”.

Amendments to the Claims:

Claim 45 has been amended to recite that “each” of the “plurality of electronic devices” of an automated data storage library is an “independently operating” entity, and the phrasing has been changed to insure that it is understood that each “electronic device” is an entity comprising all of the elements “(a) a network interface”, “(b) an electronic persistent visual display”, “(c) at least one said operational element”, and “(d) a processor”. The words “independently operating” are not present in the specification, but are clear from the depiction in FIG. 1 of the electronic device as an independently operating entity, together with the description of FIG. 1 at page 8, line 7, to page 16, line 4. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that no new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. 103:

The Examiner rejects Claims 45-52 and 54-56 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishi (USPN 5,426,581) in view of Kayser (USPN 6,089,453).

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to Claim 45, from which Claims 46-52 and 54-56 depend, makes it clear that each “electronic device” is a complete unit as defined in the claims, and precludes the term “comprising” from being read on elements not associated with the electronic device.

Kishi and Kayser are submitted to teach away from Applicants' claimed library with electronic devices where Applicants' claimed network interface, the display, the storage of the update information and the update information itself all are common to each defined electronic device.

Kishi teaches an automated storage and retrieval system having a scanner, robotic accessor and a processor. Kishi also discusses data drives.

Kayser teaches a pricing distribution system with a main distribution loop and branch loops which distribute "pricing and product information for products in stores or warehouses" (Abstract, lines 2-3) in the form of signals for persistent display tags, and a display circuit within each display tag that generates a display in response to the information signals. (Column 4, lines 25-45).

The pricing and product information is distributed from a central processor to the displays over a network is mounted on the store shelf and is about whatever is removably placed on the store shelf, and any local information storage is only part of the display, a different entity than whatever is on the store shelf.

The information of Kayser relates to whatever is on the store shelf; whereas the network of Kayser is between the processor and the displays, and none of the processor, display or storage is common to whatever is on the store shelf. In contrast, Applicants' Claim 45 defines a plurality of electronic devices, "each electronic device" comprising all of the elements "(a) a network interface", "(b) an electronic persistent visual display", "(c) at least one said operational element", and "(d) a processor", and the stored and displayed information regards "said at least one operational element and said processor".

Kishi does not fill this void. The information discussed by the Examiner regarding Kishi is only of a specific location of the robotic accessor (scanner), unrelated to "said update input signal comprising selected said information regarding at least one of hardware, software and firmware of said at least one operational element and said

processor". Kishi does not even discuss a processor or an update signal for a data drive. Therefore, Kishi and Kayser are submitted to teach away from Applicants' claims.

Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 45 and dependent Claims 46-52 and 54-56 patentably define over Kishi and Kayser.


Cited Patents and Publications:

The Examiner additionally cited and made of record USPN 5,613,154 (Burke et al.); USPAP 2003/0125834 (Campbell et al.); and USPAP 2002/0073413 (Goodman).

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants Claims 45-52 and 54-56 also patentably define thereover.

Respectfully submitted,
Brian G. Goodman, et al.

Date: Dec. 18, 2008

By: 
John H. Holcombe (#20,620)
Attorney for Applicants

From: IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law
8987 E. Tanque Verde Rd. #309-374
Tucson, AZ 85749
Telephone: (520) 760-6629

JHH/cw